

aspect of Mr. Rodgers' work that is truly creative and, I think, is not generally fully understood. He has phrased it himself by saying that Broadway is a two-way street, and what he means by this is that if the theater and the musical theater is to have its greatest future, to realize its real potentiality, there must be closer and more continuous contact between the theater, itself, the professional theater, and the world of education; and I'll not take the time today to tell you all the things that he has done in this area.

But for those of us who have been inspired and who have caught something of his dream of what can be done, the announcement which I am about to make simply makes a fitting climax.

It is my observation that there is a very close connection between creativity and generosity because, really, creativity is the giving of one's self. Mr. Rodgers, throughout his career, has shown this generosity to the point that, on this occasion, when we are supposed to be celebrating his birthday, he himself has made a gift.

On behalf of President Kirk, who is in Europe and not able to be here today, I am happy to make the announcement that the Rodgers and Hammerstein Foundation has made an initial pledge of \$150,000 toward the principal theater of the projected Columbia University Art Center.

This, of course, is the culmination of the dream I mentioned a moment ago.

I have this additional message from President Kirk: The university is most grateful for this splendid action by the Rodgers and Hammerstein Foundation toward the principal theater to be incorporated in the new Arts Center in Columbia.

I have proposed that this theater be called "the Rodgers and Hammerstein." If that should come to be the case, nothing could give more satisfaction to me, to the Columbia community, or to the friends of Richard Rodgers and Oscar Hammerstein everywhere.

The only thing I can add to that is to say, "Many happy returns of the day."

Mr. RODGERS. On a 60th birthday, I imagine it is mandatory to have a philosophy. Somebody once wrote Oscar a letter and said, "What is the saddest word that you know of?" and he replied, "But."

I have arrived at a philosophy, sitting here, and it is equally short, and what I have to say will be equally short. I have never done anything alone in my life. I had to be conceived by two people. I had to be nursed, I had to be brought up, I had to be taught. I was given a scholarship in music, I was sent to Columbia University by parents who were not rich but who could do it. I have shows but I have chorus girls dancing in them; I don't do the dancing. I have these men playing on the stage, they do my work for me.

I wish that this could be a model for what is going on. Then the walls, the barbed wire, would come down. People would not be running out of a country. They would be doing something for each other.

This morning I talked to Alan Lerner on the phone and he said, "You'll have to say something." He said, "For God's sake don't be humble."

Well, I'll come to my one-word philosophy: It's one I've lived by and on which I expect to live by. And the word is: "Help." I thank you all very much.

ity of their efforts made Telstar possible. I consider the development so important that I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Record at this point a summary of the firms that participated in that great American achievement and where they come from. The number of participating firms in each State is provided in this list; and the names of the firms themselves are available in my office to any of my colleagues who are interested.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Telstar is the name of the Bell System's experimental communications satellite. This project has been specifically concerned with learning how a communications satellite gets along in outer space, how it works and how it can link earth stations. While it is not an operating system, Telstar has already provided much of the technical data and operational know-how such a system will require.

Project Telstar is unique. It is the first use of space for other than official Government purposes. And communicating by satellite may, for a long time, be the only direct contact most Americans will have with space-age technology. But it won't be just a novelty.

A satellite communications system is needed because people are making more and more overseas telephone calls. Today the American Telephone & Telegraph system operates more than 600 telephone-grade circuits for overseas communications. By 1965, it is said twice that many will be needed and that by 1970, the demand will have doubled again. And in 1980, it is estimated that 10,000 circuits will be needed for telephone use alone—with perhaps an additional 2,000 for more specialized communications.

Hopefully, a satellite communications system will be able to help meet this demand efficiently and economically.

The satellite corporation, as being set up by recent legislation, will not be ready for commercial business for some time, probably not before 1965, and even then satellite communication is an economic unknown.

PROJECT TELSTAR'S COST

Since its formal inception in 1961, about \$50 million has been spent on Project Telstar.

A satellite communications system is possible today because two streams of research have been fused: private research in communications techniques, Government-sponsored research in rocketry. Without the transportation provided by Government-developed rockets, Telstar would not have gotten off the ground. Without the communications industry research and development, there would have been no Telstar to get off the ground.

Bell Laboratories built five flyable Telstar satellites at a cost of about \$1 million apiece, including development expenses. Many more millions were spent on developmental models. Each satellite requires detailed attention by a corps of highly skilled scientists and craftsmen. It is not a process easily shifted to mass production. There are 3,600 sapphire-covered solar cells set in the satellite's surface. Inside, there are 4,300 other parts; 2,500 of them are active semiconductor devices.

Telstar was shot into the sky by a Delta launch vehicle. This rocket was developed for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration by the Douglas Aircraft Co. About 2,000 suppliers had a role in the success of Project Telstar. They provided a good deal of equipment and services which the final production team at Bell Laboratories fashioned into the Andover earth station and the experimental satellites. Four out of

five of them are small businesses, with less than 500 employees.

These suppliers are located in 37 of the 50 States and the District of Columbia. They range from a single firm in Janesboro, Ark., and Huntington, W. Va., to more than 550 businesses in New Jersey who had a part in the program.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

The story really starts in the 1930's. That's when Bell Labs invented the sensitive horn reflector antenna and low noise receivers—equipment which plays a crucial role in satellite communications today.

Since World War II, the Bell Laboratories have produced the Bell solar battery, the transistor and the solid-state ruby maser.

These are some of the financial dimensions of the project. Telstar is not just the product of a lot of money and engineering skill. It's not just the contributions of 2,000 suppliers coordinated by the purchase orders and exacting specifications of Bell Labs. Telstar is principally the product of a way of thinking, a way of acting.

This is the intangible vitality that gives the private sector of the economy its perpetual modernness. It comes from the decision to look to the future; to see tomorrow's needs, and plan for the day after. This is the decision that produced Telstar.

The number of participating firms in each State is listed as follows:

Alabama	1
Arizona	1
Arkansas	1
California	100
Colorado	2
Connecticut	84
Delaware	5
Florida	25
Indiana	12
Iowa	3
Kansas	1
Kentucky	4
Maine	43
Maryland	22
Massachusetts	117
Michigan	20
Minnesota	12
Missouri	3
Nebraska	1
New Hampshire	10
New Jersey	468
New York	449
North Carolina	44
Ohio	73
Oklahoma	2
Oregon	4
Pennsylvania	202
Rhode Island	8
South Carolina	2
Tennessee	4
Texas	3
Virginia	5
Washington	3
West Virginia	1
Wisconsin	14
Washington, D.C.	3

THE CUBAN SITUATION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on the question of Cuba we have heard a great deal and we are told a great deal about what the United States should do for Latin America. I feel that I have been as forward looking and as active in that area as anyone in the Congress in all the years I have been in the other body and in this body.

As often happens in life, however, the tables are sometimes turned. For the question now is: What will Latin America do for us? I think that this should be a very welcome moment to the people of Latin America. The people of Latin America do not have to give us

aid to build up our industry, or technicians to develop our resources, or medicine, medical help, universities; or even the exchange of fellowships; though we welcome that and it is a very exciting educational activity in which to participate. But what Latin America will have to give us right now is understanding and support—and support which may be of a very material kind—for as a result of what has happened in Cuba, not only we, but also all the Americas are faced with a grave challenge.

Notwithstanding the very reassuring words of our President and his legal interpretation of the Monroe Doctrine, the fact is that Chairman Khrushchev has said the Monroe Doctrine is a dead letter. President Kennedy has said that the Monroe Doctrine still remains the binding policy of our Nation. Both cannot be right and they are not. As I understand, the Monroe Doctrine relates to the establishment certainly of any military base in any country of the Western Hemisphere by any foreign power which was not there when the Monroe Doctrine was announced.

Whether technically or not, those who are on Cuban soil as soldiers begin to establish the impression clearly that the U.S.S.R. has set up a military base in the Western Hemisphere in Cuba. The President may be perfectly correct. I agree with him about our not being precipitate and hotheads in the situation; yet improvidence or lack of decisiveness could destroy all of us in a situation of that character.

The issue is very clear, and the issue is only partially dealt with by the idea of containment, which is essentially what the President gave voice to the other day. The issue will still remain even if the Cuban Communist regime does not move out of its own area and into aggression against other states. Certainly it is now a base for subversion and a base for Communist infection—with the danger of aggression—for all of the Americas, and in a most vigorous and intransigent way that has been, is being, and will be transmitted to the other American Republics.

One thing is clear to me. This is a challenge and a very grave emergency for our country which has been building up, as we all very well knew, for the last year and a half. But there is a great will in this country, in my opinion, to deal with it primarily in terms of agreement, at least with the great majority of the other American states.

If there is one thing I feel personally the American people are convinced of, it is that if it is humanly possible to do so, we should have a common policy and a common course of action with the other American States under the Charter of the Organization of American States and the treaties and agreements entered into, since it only takes a three-quarters vote to act. That is something which we must understand.

The vote may not be unanimous. But a three-quarters vote is a large vote, and to be truly effective, should include the principal countries of Latin America, the countries of great population, great territory, and perhaps, in a somewhat more advanced state economically than

some of the others. So that is what I meant a minute ago when I said this is an occasion when the countries of Latin America have an opportunity to do something for and with us.

The United States wants a common policy, in my view, with respect to Cuba, if action should be required, in order to insulate this menace or perhaps even to move against it in some appropriate way. The people of the United States know that the days of unilateral so-called "gunboat" diplomacy in Latin America by us are gone; they are obsolescent—but this does not mean inaction—it means, on the contrary, more effective action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. May I have 2 additional minutes?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. The way in which our country could best move with the consent and approval of the great majority of its citizens is to obtain a consensus—and I use that word advisedly—among enough of the Latin American nations so that our action would be, even if mainly implemented by us as their agent, a group action. Such action is extremely desirable. So as one American and as one Senator, I would address a plea to our Latin American neighbors on the basis of the presentation made yesterday to them by our Secretary of State, Dean Rusk, and in the spirit of the bipartisan foreign policy which I think is the most noble spirit Congress has developed in modern times.

I feel deeply honored that it is the spirit of Senator Arthur Vandenberg which would appeal to our Federal legislators in the other Latin American countries, as the leaders of their people, to give guidance and leadership to their people so that in this hour, which I think is getting more and more serious in the eyes of the American people, we may have their good will, their cooperation, their backing and support in the action which would appear to be indicated with respect, first, to the insulation of the Communist menace in Cuba, and perhaps in consultation with the other American states in some effort to protect even more the Americas against the Communists.

The details for implementing that will, I am sure, be the subject of discussion. I have my ideas; others have theirs. But for the purpose of my remarks today I hope very much that we may speak in this way as people to people with the understanding and plea that this is one time that the Latin American peoples can do something for us to back and support us.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

In the spirit of bipartisanship referred to by the Senator from New York, I wish to join him in his discussion of Cuba. I join him in my capacity as chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs. I would have the Record show that I completely agree with the steps which have been taken by the President of the United States thus far in connection with the Cuban danger.

I heartily endorse the appeal of the President of the United States and the Secretary of State to our American friends and allies to the south of us.

This is, as the senior Senator from Oregon has said in regard to the Cuban matter for many months, a joint problem which confronts our Latin American neighbors as well as the United States. In a very real sense it is a greater threat to our Latin American friends than it is to the United States.

I, along with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] attended the Punta del Este Conference earlier this year. At Punta del Este, as the Senator knows, we adopted a series of resolutions which were combined into the Act of Punta del Este. One of those resolutions, unanimously adopted, made very clear that the free nations of the Western Hemisphere intend to stand together against the threat of the spread of communism into the hemisphere from Cuba.

I would only add to what the Senator from New York has said that it is highly to be desired that there be some action through the Organization of American States in regard to the Communist threat to the Western Hemisphere from the Russian buildup in Cuba. I hope that very soon a Conference of OAS of the foreign ministers of Latin American countries and the United States will be called for a discussion as to the *modus operandi* that ought to be adopted in meeting the Communist buildup by Russia as a beachhead in Cuba.

I am satisfied, if such a conference is had, and the *modus operandi* are discussed, that we will reach not only a three-fourths vote, but I would be very much surprised if we did not reach a unanimous vote. It is crystal clear that the free nations of the hemisphere must stand together against this threat.

Let us assume, unpleasant as the thought is, for even a fleeting moment that a three-fourths vote is not had. Then the United States will still have the responsibility, to take what course of action the facts show may be necessary to take, to protect the security of the American people from the threat of a Russian Communist beachhead almost on our very shores. Whatever action we take to protect our own national security we will likewise thus take to protect the national security of every free nation to the south of us.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Oregon. I associate myself with his views as he has expressed them.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum. I ask the minority leader if he is willing to share the time on the quorum call.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Certainly.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum and ask that the time be equally divided.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

Mr. MORSE: Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the acting majority leader a question. Will Senators be ready to proceed with their speeches?

Mr. HUMPHREY: Yes; but first I have items to place in the RECORD.

Mr. MORSE: The quorum call has been taking place with the understanding that there would be an equal division of the time required for the call. If it is necessary to have another quorum call, I feel that I have a duty to make certain that Senators will be here to speak at some length on the bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY: I have asked the aids of the Senate to communicate with two Senators who wish to speak. They will be here promptly. If it is necessary to have another quorum call, I shall ask unanimous consent that the time be divided equally between the two sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANSFIELD in the chair). Such consent cannot be requested at this time; but if there is no objection, the call for the quorum may be rescinded, and the renewal of that request may be made at the proper time.

Mr. MORSE: I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER: Without objection, the request of the Senator from Minnesota is agreed to.

HOPE IN THE CONGO

Mr. HUMPHREY: Mr. President, I would like to call to the attention of the Senate a very important and encouraging sequence of events which has just taken place in the troubled Congo, an area which has been of great concern to us all.

Acting U.N. Secretary General U Thant 2 weeks ago proposed a plan for national reconciliation in the Congo which provides for a sound basis for bringing about Congolese unity. This plan contains the following principal points:

First, the adoption of a Federal constitution which contains necessary powers delegated to the Federal Government and all other powers reserved to the provincial governments.

Second, the development of a fiscal program including Federal and provincial revenues, a program of foreign exchange control, and a unified currency.

Third, integration of the military.

This plan was publicly endorsed by many governments of the free world including those of Belgium and Britain. Our own Government gave full support to the plan. Significantly, the Soviets attacked it. Prime Minister Adoula immediately accepted the plan in all its detail as a just and honorable basis for national reconciliation. President Tshombe of Katanga Province substantially accepted the plan.

The important thing, however, is not to haggle over the language of Mr. Tshombe's reply but to move forward immediately on implementing the practical details of the plan as the Acting Secretary General has urged. It will serve the world well if both Prime Minister Adoula and President Tshombe approach these steps in good faith. If this

is done and done promptly frustration, despair, and danger may give way to peace and hope.

I think it is important at this critical juncture to give full credit to the United Nations which by its patient and untiring efforts may have opened a door which many thought was closed forever. The difficult part may be yet to come but I wish to assure the Acting Secretary General and his staff that they have the full support of the American people in this endeavor.

Mr. President, I do not want to go into the Congo situation in detail today because we are now in a delicate moment where the real work must be done behind closed doors by those on the spot and not on the public forums of the world. If the job at hand is tackled in earnest the time may soon come when the Congo crisis will be nothing but a bad dream of the past.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD a recent speech by Assistant Secretary of State G. Mennen Williams, which explains in substantial detail the program proposed by the U.N. Acting Secretary General, U Thant, as a plan for reconciliation in the Congo and a basis for Congo unity.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE UNITED NATIONS PLAN FOR THE CONGO
(Address by the Honorable G. Mennen Williams, Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs, before the Jewish War Veterans National Convention, Detroit, Mich., Thursday, August 30, 1962)

Fellow veterans, I am pleased to address a veterans' group today because I want to speak about a country balanced between strife and progress—the Republic of the Congo. I can think of no more timely or more important topic to discuss with you who have experienced past failures to find peaceful solutions.

A United Nations plan for Congo unity was announced on August 20 by Acting Secretary General U Thant, and its early acceptance was indicated by Congolese Prime Minister Cyrille Adoula. Last Friday, Robert Gardiner, chief of the U.N. operation in the Congo, presented the United Nations plan for uniting that unfortunately divided country to representatives of Katanga Province.

Since its presentation to the Katangan provincial government of Mr. Moïse Tshombe, Mr. Adoula announced that his Government had studied the Secretary General's plan and gave its agreement to it. He noted that his Government's only criterion for judging the Congo problem was in the context of 14 million human beings aspiring for a better life, and added:

"We hope all countries will adopt this view and support in all phases the Secretary General's plan, which takes into account our observations and is in accord with the Government of the Congo's point of view. If all of these conditions are realized, we do not doubt an era of peace and prosperity would begin for the Congo, which could, in fruitful cooperation with all nations make its contribution to the international community."

Over this past weekend, the U.S. Government also announced its support of the Acting Secretary General's efforts to reach a settlement in the Congo.

The U.S. announcement pointed out that the U.N. plan offers a reasonable basis upon which Congolese leaders can settle their differences. Our Government said that the plan offers compelling reasons for other na-

tions to lend their support and that statesmanship in the Congo can put that nation on the road to federal unity and progress.

Such progress, the United States concluded, will enable the United Nations and countries like the United States to devote greater resources to economic and technical assistance in the Congo.

It is gratifying to be able to say today that many interested nations have indicated their firm support for the U.N. plan. For example, last weekend, Britain announced its support of the plan and on Tuesday the Belgian Government issued a statement of support.

While there has not yet been time for an official acceptance of the U.N. plan from the provincial government of Katanga, provision for a federal system of government for the Congo enhances the possibility of its acceptance by Katanga. Evariste Kimba, who handles foreign affairs for Mr. Tshombe, said in a letter to Secretary General U Thant following his announcement of the plan on August 20 that the plan "contains a number of positive elements." There is considerable reason to hope that Mr. Tshombe will support the plan. On August 1 and August 21, he stated his belief that Katanga was ready to join a Congolese federation.

On the initial evidence, then, we are hopeful that the U.N. plan is the basis for Congolese unity and can put an end to Katanga's secession.

The resolution of this problem is naturally one which the Congolese themselves must achieve. You will recall the United Nations was invited into the Congo by the Congolese Government to assist that new nation in overcoming postindependence disorders, in safeguarding Congolese unity, and in rebuilding the nation's administrative and economic health. The United Nations prevented unilateral Soviet intervention and succeeded to a large extent in keeping order. It has helped maintain Congolese administrative services and assisted in the reestablishment of parliamentary government.

The principal block to Congolese unity and economic progress today is this Katangan problem. Prime Minister Adoula's government was established under orders from Parliament to end this secession, and no Congolese Government can long hope to remain in office without demonstrating progress toward this goal. Until this is achieved, Congolese resources, both human and material, will be diverted from the essential long-range task of nation building and economic progress. Until unity is achieved, the threats of chaos and renewed Soviet intervention are ever-present dangers.

We welcome the plan put forth by Acting Secretary General U Thant, because it offers a reasonable way to achieve these goals and head off these dangers.

Because this U.N. plan was not widely publicized at the time of its announcement, I would like to take a few minutes this morning to point out its salient features. There are seven principal points in the U.N. plan:

1. The National Government, after consultation with the Provincial governments and interested political groups, will present a Federal constitution to the Parliament in September. The United Nations is providing legal experts to assist in drafting this document. Under present law, this constitution cannot become law without a two-thirds vote of the Parliament, in which all Provinces and parties are represented, plus approval by the provincial assemblies. Under the proposed Federal constitution, certain powers will be delegated to the National Government. These include—

- (a) Foreign affairs.
- (b) National defense (other than local police functions).
- (c) Customs.
- (d) Currency, exchange control, and fiscal policy.